

*Kyle B./S*  
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

IS NOT MAILED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 1704.) If a reply to the last Office Action is better described than has been provided to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

It is not necessary for an applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview. (A filer despatched, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be mailed back to the filer.)

This would raise new issues after the fact.  
possible use of the specific facts to achieve what is the examiner noted that  
anypecial length form doing so. Also discussed second terminals and  
idea of using corrective search in claims as corrective measure and  
Description of the general nature of what was agreed to in an agreement was reached, or any other comments. Discussed

Interview of prior art discussed: *YOKOTA, ASAHI*

Claim(s) discussed: 1+

Agreement  was reached.  was not reached.

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No || yes, brief description.

Type:  Telephone  Televised Conference  Personal (copy is given to  Applicant  Applicant's representative).

Date of interview *10/11/07*

(1) *K. Barfield* (2) *F. Heyhurst* (3) *J. Roper*  
(a) *M. Devon*

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

### INTERVIEW SUMMARY

DATE MAILED:

*1792*

EXAMINER	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
Barfield	10/16/03
APPLICANT NUMBER	FILING DATE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office	FIRST NAME APPLICANT

